

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/040,055	12/31/2001	James K. Falbo	NTI-030	1929	
29477 7	590 06/16/2004		EXAMINER		
BEVER HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP 1432 CONCANNON BLVD			ROSSOSHEK, YELENA		
BLDG G	THOIT BEYE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LIVERMORE,	CA 94550-6006		2825		

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N .	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/040,055	FALBO ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Helen B Rossoshek	2825				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the c ver sheet with the	correspondenc add	lress			
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in a rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper replication at the places the application	ation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the condition of	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T date on which the petition under 37 Cl of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main three main th	ng date of the final reject HE FINAL REJECTION. FR 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriate or the fee.	ion. See MPEP ropriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or			
imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C						
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or si	mplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancelli	ng a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	ıs.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· · · —	·	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>11,33 and 37-43</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,12-32,34-36 and 44-54</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
10. Other:	SUP	MATTHEW SMITH ERVISORY PATENT EXA	MINER			
	11	ECHNOLOGY CENTER 2	800			

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The limitation and term "layout imperfection" of the claims is very broad and even the Specification does not give clear definition. The phraseology of the specification, especially paragraph{0004} leaves enough space for the interpretation the layout imperfection as a defect, which is a subject for a modification by OPC process, since "these layout imperfections are not necessarily defects", but may be are defects.